

REMARKS

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, 7-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,250,150 to *DuBois*; claims 2, 5-6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DuBois*; claims 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DuBois* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,231,700 to *Cutshall*; and claims 12-14 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DuBois* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,862,521 to *van Marwijk*.

Independent claim 1 of the subject application is directed to a protective glove comprising a glove portion made of mesh material, a wrist portion also made of mesh material, and an elastic element attached to the wrist portion in the form of a single coiled spring wider than it is thick to improve comfort.

The Examiner asserts that *DuBois* discloses a protective glove having a glove portion and wrist portion fabricated from a mesh material and an elastic element attached to the wrist portion in the form of a coiled spring that is wider than it is thick.

However, the applicant submits that *DuBois* fails to disclose all of the elements of the applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, *DuBois* fails to disclose a single coiled spring wider than it is thick to improve comfort.

The Examiner cites to Col. 2, lines 67-72 and Figs. 1 and 2 of *DuBois* to support his assertion that *DuBois* discloses a coiled spring that is thick as claimed by the applicant. This portion of *DuBois* is reproduced below:

The bottom or entrance of the mitten is surrounded by one or more coils 7 of resilient wire connected to the edge of the woven wire forming the body of the mitten, and designed to yield when the hand is inserted into the mitten and make the latter fit snugly around the wrist.

DuBois fails to state that the coil of wire 7 is wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant. DuBois only discloses the use of one or more coils of wire and fails to disclose any specifics about the coil at all. Figures 1 and 2 also fail to show a single spring wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant. It may be the Examiner's contention that the combination of coils 7 shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of DuBois is wider than it is thick. However, amended independent claim 1 recites a single coiled spring wider than it is thick, which is not disclosed by DuBois. Claim 1 is patentable over DuBois for at least the reason that DuBois fails to disclose a single spring wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant.

In response to the applicant's prior response, the Examiner states that DuBois does not mention anywhere in the disclosure that the spring is a common helical spring as suggested by the applicant. However, the applicant submits that DuBois does not mention anywhere in the disclosure that the spring is wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant. Such features cannot be read into the disclosure of DuBois. To anticipate claim 1 of the subject application, DuBois needs to disclose each and every element of the claim. Nowhere does DuBois disclose that the spring is wider than it is thick as claimed by the applicant. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over DuBois for this additional reason.

Independent claims 15, 16, and 17 and dependent claims 2-14 also include the features of a single coiled spring wider than it is thick, and are also patentable over DuBois, either alone or in combination with the additional references cited by the Examiner, for at least the above reasons.

If for any reason this Preliminary Amendment is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason D. Shanske
Reg. No. 43,915

JDS/jmc